

CITY OF REDMOND JOINT COMMISSIONS MEETING

TRAILS COMMISSION, PARK BOARD, AND ARTS COMMISSION

MINUTES – September 24, 2003
Redmond Senior Center

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

- Trails Commission (RTC): Chairperson Gary Smith, Maureen McCoy, Julie Barnfather, Kris Colt, Sue Chenault, Glenn Eades, Ken Bechmann; Youth Advocate Emily Thompson
- Park Board (RPB): Chair Lori Snodgrass, Suzanne Querry, Seth Kelsey, David Ladd, Sue Stewart
- Arts Commission (RAC): Vice Chair Kay Tarapolsi, Jill Schmidt, Heidi Houghton, Phil Teller

ABSENT: Park Board Members David Degenstein, Ann Callister, and youth advocate Katherine Zak; Arts Commissioners Chairperson Rebecca LaBrunerie, Una McAlinden, Latha Sambamurti, Kate Cochran, and youth advocates Joscelyn Doleac and Nicole Rollofson

CITY STAFF: Tim Cox, Manager of Parks Planning; Danny Hopkins, Parks and Recreation Director; Tom Trueblood, Recreation Manager; Melna Skillingstead, Arts Coordinator; Sandra Bettencourt, Recreation Program Manager; Pam Maybee, Recording Secretary; Mike Paul, City Hall Project Engineer

AUDIENCE: Cindy Edens, Wright-Runstad, Senior Project Manager; David Glassman, Project Manager, and Ming Zhang, Designer, of MulvannyG2 Architects; Kris Snider, Hewitt Landscape Architect

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

RTC Chairperson Smith called to order the joint meeting of the Park Board, Trails Commission, and Arts Commission at 7:15 p.m. at the Redmond Senior Center. RPB Chair Snodgrass asked members to introduce themselves.

II. BOARD/COMMISSION RECAPS

Commissioner McCoy, RTC, recapped highlights of the Trails Commission in 2003:

- Communicate with staff and advocate for the Bear-Evans Creek Trail (BECT), which includes linkages to SE Redmond, crossings at Novelty Hill, and other issues, e.g., wetlands
- Advocate to City Council that they recognize trails as a form of transportation, thereby enabling a legitimate use of transportation dollars
- Provide input and advocacy for the BNSF as a trail through the City
- Create a trails map to include biking and other types of trail uses
- Advocate a unity of trails along the NE 116th developments
- Pursue and advocate the “missing link” portion of trail between Farrel-McWhirter Park and the Watershed Preserve
- Insure public accessibility to Conrad Olson Farm
- Promote Sammamish River bridge/trail (to be built this winter)
- Support and give input on River Trail developments/changes for water trails
- Advocate the East Lake Sammamish trail

Commissioner Schmidt, RAC, recapped highlights of the Arts Commission in 2003:

- Dedicated Outdoor Sculpture Garden Exhibit; sculptures will remain until June 2004; Commissioner Tarapolsi, curator
- Designed Outdoor Sculpture Garden brochure to describe the pieces and to be used as a guide for teachers and parents for children’s field trips
- Indoor art gallery at ORSCC next month, 10/9/03, 6:00 p.m., before the regular RAC meeting (all were invited); gallery will show two artists per month, with two different artists every month
- Selected artists for Winter Performance Series to start in January, showing Saturday evenings/matinees at Rose Hill Junior High
- Fire Station 11 plaza and bronze firefighter sculpture; collaborating with Redmond Rotary to raise money for a bench
- African American photography exhibit at ORSCC and City Hall began at the beginning of September
- Helped Seattle Art Museum find two Redmond locations (Redmond Library and Public Safety Building) for two sculpture pieces to display for three years during the museum’s renovation
- Reservoir Park art carving project; partnered with Public Works Water Department; dedication 10/16/03 at 4:00 p.m. (all were invited)
- Sent out a Call for Artists for art projects for Perrigo Community Park and Grass Lawn Park
- City Hall visual art exhibit will be displayed until November

- Co-sponsor with R.A.S.P. (Redmond Association of the Spoken Word) for Redmond's literary arts festival, *Write Out Loud!*
- Presented Arts in the Parks with corporate sponsors
- Community volunteers participate in Arts Commission committees and projects
- Working on developing an independent film festival
- Looking to place more art pieces in parks and trails, e.g., extending out from the Saturday Market

Park Board Member Kelsey, RPB, recapped highlights of the Park Board in 2003:

- Working with staff and providing input on PRO Plan updates
- Provided input and support to Idylwood Park improvements; preparing for a master plan with citizen and user group input
- Provided input on Perrigo and Grass Lawn Community Park developments
- Currently conducting a contest to rename the Coast Guard (Avondale) Park
- Focus on park land at new City Hall campus

III. New City Hall Review

Mike Paul, City project manager for the new City Hall, reviewed how the project was organized:

- City Council selected a development team, Wright-Runstad, and a non-profit, National Development Council, to finance, design, and construct a new 100,000 square foot City Hall and separate parking garage
- The City will lease two pieces of property to the non-profit, then they will finance and construct the building with Wright-Runstad, then lease it back to the City for 30 years
- Current schedule: occupy new City Hall by late 2005/early 2006
- About four times the size of the existing City Hall
- The old City Hall and Tech Center will be demolished
- Council chamber may be phased out (still deciding)

Paul introduced the City Hall design team:

- Ming Zhang, MulvannyG2 Architecture (MG2), building designer
- David Glassman, MulvannyG2 Architecture, project manager
- Cindy Edens, Wright Runstad, senior project manager
- Kris Snider, Hewitt Architect, landscape architect

Zhang, using the model and three sketches, described the layout of the city hall design and how employees and public could use certain aspects.

Questions/discussion from Commissioners and staff:

- **Parking**

LaBrunerie asked about parking between the library and the City Hall. Zhang answered there would be two more additional parking rows. Kelsey asked about underground parking. Edens responded there would be one level underground for City fleet vehicles and carpools, visitors would park outside, and City employees in the garage. There are no transit pullouts in the design. Paul noted that the parking garage is in the budget and in place.

Kelsey expressed disappointment that the Park Board was not brought in earlier in the process so their concerns could be voiced. He objected to the aboveground parking garage; rather, he supported an underground garage that would not take up land space. Edens explained that although an underground garage could be done, due to the high water table, it would be cost prohibitive. Redmond employees and residents would be unwilling to pay for parking stalls in order to offset the cost of an underground facility.

Hopkins added that the landscape is yet to be determined, and there will be much opportunity for the Board/Commissions to give their input. Trueblood reported that the City has been cutting back over the years in parking stalls per employee. The state mandates that the City must reach certain goals of reduction of stalls per employee. McCoy noted that the City has been antagonistic regarding parking for trail access. Trueblood replied it is because there is a limited number of sites with a required amount of sites for public parking for City business.

- **Art**

Tarapolsi inquired about incorporating art in certain areas, e.g., the City Hall building wall. Edens responded that there is room for arts on the building, however discussion on that would be at a later time as the project develops out of the conceptual stage.

- **River Trail**

Eades asked that the architects preserve the linear usage of the Sammamish River Trail when they plan the diverted trail into the campus. Glassman assured the linear usage would not be interrupted; the diverted trail would only invite pedestrian activity to come in to the campus area. Chenault stated that, per standards, the river trail is to include a soft surface trail alongside, and she requested they allow for that in their construction.

- **Design/Construction**

Teller questioned whether any “green technologies” would be incorporated in the architect specifics. Zhang and Glassman referred to LEED (Leadership in Environmental and Energy Design) whose intent is to integrate sustainable design into the process by making intelligent choices that support restoration/existence of green space, water, natural resources. They would look at the design of the building and how the building would be used. Glassman believed there is a desire by the City to operate the building in green fashion.

McCoy asked MulvannyG2 to describe the council chamber architecture. Glassman responded that it might need to change. Due to the fact the chamber concept design has received nicknames from the public already, they are taking a step back and looking at it again. It may be an aesthetic the City is not comfortable having. MG2 will design what the City requests.

Bettencourt inquired regarding incorporating an artist in the design team to expand construction costs. Edens answered they would work with the percent for art and the construction budget; however, it is too early now to determine how they would work together. They will be looking at those opportunities in the future with the design development.

Teller asked Edens whether or not the labor pool for construction workers was drawn from Washington State licensed companies. Edens replied licensed general construction companies were hired from the state by Wright-Runstad.

Landscape architect, Kris Snider, from Hewitt Landscape, new to the design team, listed some of his work background: Redmond Town Center's public spaces, trail, and overall landscape, Overlake affordable housing landscaping project. He is familiar with the design review process and history, and appreciates the City's vision. Tarapolsi requested he keep in mind an open space opportunity toward the Rivertrail for music performances.

Hopkins outlined the most efficient way to coordinate input:

- Use the Park Board as the key meeting to address ideas, questions, and concerns.
- Funnel questions/information to staff or Park Board chair; they will notify other Commissioners when it would be addressed at the Park Board meeting; Commissions may send a representative to that Board meeting.
- As drawings develop, they will be distributed for review through Parks' staff; Commissioners may obtain copies from them.

IV. Other Issues

A. Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Right-of-Way

Smith proposed a discussion on the future of the BNSF right-of-way. Snodgrass noted it would be master planned with public input, but the source of funds utilized for purchase could determine how it is planned. Hopkins reported negotiations are still taking place:

- Currently working to get appropriate evaluations.
- As negotiations mature it will direct how the site is planned, and would include much public input.
- The way the site will be purchased will bring inherent restrictions.
- \$2.5 million is available in the Public Works portion of the CIP for the BNSF.
- About \$200,000 is available in the Parks portion of the CIP for the BNSF.
- The land purchase is one of City Council's highest priority.

B. Park Bond

1. Background

Hopkins distributed copies of the Park Improvement Plan (PIP), noting the Park Board was instrumental in putting together the document. He emphasized the PIP is a working document, in order to keep a perspective:

- Pages 1 & 2: CIP projects (6 year program)
- Page 3: unfunded projects (7-10 year projection)

The Park Board was charged by City Council to get a pulse for the bond, i.e., if a bond was needed, how much it would cost, priorities, and timing. The Council granted \$80,000 to work on the bond. Parks have the Council's support for a bond. Although there is some difference of opinion on acquisition versus development of existing properties, there will most likely be a balance between the two.

Hopkins noted the new City Hall would be a financial stress, and the park bond would tap into the same potential revenue source (the taxpayer).

Snodgrass reported that Kirkland and Bellevue, who have both undergone a bond process, would be giving the Board some input on their experience:

- The process they went through to gauge citizens' acceptable threshold

- The more specific the items presented to the public, the better the success rate
- Key projects and priorities must be identified—where amenities would be going—to help sell the public
- The goal is to be good stewards of the taxpayer's money

2. Money/Grants/Cost

Eades asked the chances of getting outside money or grants. Cox responded they are good; Hopkins added that usually about 15-20% in grant money could be leveraged on a project.

Hopkins stated staff would be defining the PIP projects with pictures and descriptive substance within the next months. There is a substantial deficit in project cost. The Park Board would assess/prioritize what projects meet the community's needs and what they might be willing to spend. Kelsey reminded that the City did a survey that showed the community supported parks, recreation, and trails. Query added that citizens also said they would be willing to pay more for them.

Cox noted there has been no discussion of a bond amount. Hopkins stated there is approximately \$32 million currently unfunded. He asked Commissioners to only look at page 3 of the PIP projects as those identified as unfunded, not as a deficit.

3. Political and Demographic Influences

Query emphasized that political realities need to be considered in order to make a bond work.

Stewart relayed that she believed the public has found dissatisfaction with Bellevue's government, yet, not so with Kirkland, which could possibly be a factor in the success of Kirkland's bond. Chenault noted a shift in Bellevue's older population base, specifically, losing its child population. Snodgrass added that Redmond was also losing its child population. Hopkins clarified it is "flat-lined" now. The adult population will disproportionately increase greater than the school-age child population (not implying that the adults are older).

4. Vision

Eades posed, What is this group's vision? He suggested picking four major projects for the bond. Kelsey believed every one of the projects should be chosen. Querry reasoned there is not a consensus yet, and that people need to come together to identify the vision. Bechmann advocated the value of having a vision when the City is going through dramatic growth and change; the City must have a vision before deciding what is going into the bond to be able to sell it to the citizens.

5. Summary

Snodgrass summarized the Board is looking at all the elements in the park bond: trails, arts, and open space. The draft PIP document identifies projects within Redmond that each Commission can use to identify priorities from their perspective. She emphasized the vision would need to be narrowed down to a package for the community.

Querry clarified that the PIP is unrelated to the park bond; rather, it is a working document to help the Park Board see the inventory of projects the City would like to do.

Schmidt observed that this is an information-gathering period right now. Once the information is gathered, then it would be easier to determine what is possible. She asked staff and the Park Board to let the rest of the Commissioners know what they are thinking/doing. This is the time to brainstorm ideas to bring to the Park Board later.

Snodgrass noted that Kirkland's bond information materials (possibly Bellevue) would be available at the next Board meeting (October 2). She suggested they could possibly share the information packets with RTC and RAC so all would have an understanding.

Timing will play heavily into the bond. It would not be sooner than a year.

Smith noted the PIP helps all to get a perspective. He believed that hearing staff and the Board describe what they are looking for as a political vehicle would help shape what can influence people and move them ahead. He emphasized more effort on the BNSF, especially because it is centrally located and is a connector. Querry observed that because it is a park bond, the money received would control/dictate the projects.

Barnfather reminded all to keep in mind that funds should be allocated to projects that would be acquired or completed; this would be a motivator for the bond to pass.

Schmidt advised to consider the economy and people's more conservative mindset and possible resistance.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Snodgrass thanked all for coming to the joint meeting. She stated that the Board would look forward to working with all Commissioners on the development of the park bond.

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Snodgrass at 9:05 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary, Pam Maybee